would have no objection to the proposed discontinuance of the present system of holding an indirect election from the Representative Assembly to the Legislative Council.

Adverting to the Committee's proposal to restrict membership to one House only, Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that such a practice obtained in all constitutional bodies in British India and there were some advantages to be derived from that system. One of such advantages was that eight members who were not in the Representative Assembly would get opportunities to serve on the Legislative Council. Popular representation on the Legislative Council would, to that extent, be increased, and the proposal would thus be in the best interests of the State.

Regarding the procedure suggested by the Committee in respect of legislation in the two Houses, Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that compared with the recommendations made by the Seal Committee in this behalf, those of the present Committee were very modest. What was proposed by the Committee was that if the Government decided upon a legislative measure and if no sitting of the Representative Assembly was to be held before a session of the Legislative Council, leave to introduce might first be obtained in the Legislative Council with a view to save time and the measure then taken before the Representative Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity. It was only a time-saving device. On that account, it should not be considered that the powers of the Assembly would be in any way curtailed. The idea of the Committee was that, in cases like the above, the measure should be placed before the Representative Assembly before it reached its select committee stage. If the wording of the amendment as recommended by the Committee was not clear, it would be clarified while passing orders on the report.

Finally, he requested the members to carefully study the report and understand the recommendations and not to be led away by the bogey that all the powers of the Representative Assembly were going to be taken away. He added that the Government for their part had not yet had sufficient time to consider the recommendations of the Committee and were going to do so with due regard to the views and opinions expressed by the House. Meanwhile, the observations, which he was just making, were being made by him only as chairman of the Committee, so that they should not be taken as representing the considered views of the Government.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA invited the attention of the Member to para 9 of His Highness' Proclamation to the effect that nothing would be done to curtail in any manner the powers and privileges granted to the Representative Assembly or the Legislative Council, and enquired whether this aspect of the question had been placed before the Committee while framing their recommendations.

Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that every kind of literature bearing on the point was placed before the Committee. If any particular recommendation was opposed to the terms of the Proclamation, surely the Government would consider whether such a recommendation should be accepted at all. In the meanwhile, however, he assured the House that the Committee was by no means prompted by a desire to curtail the powers of either the Assembly or the Legislative Council.

Srimati SAKAMMA enquired whether Government would sympathetically consider her request that representation be given to women's interest on the Legislative Council.

Mr. RAJAGOPALACHARI replied that there were no recommendations in that behalf in the Committee's report, but that, all the same, Government would consider the request.

RESOLUTIONS—(*concld.*).

Resolution No. 2.

Tolls on Bullock Carts.

Mr. V. VENKATAPPA moved the following resolution :—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that toll

levied on bullock carts, under the new Road Traffic and Buses Regulation, VI of 1935, be immediately abolished."

He said that in the matter of taxing the bullock carts, there was a discussion in the House a few years back and the then First Member of Council was pleased to say that it was far from the intention of the Government to go back upon the promise contained in the Dewan's Concluding Speech at the Budget Session of the House in June 1929, which was as follows:—

"Government will be pleased to accede to your request in this matter and orders will issue exempting from 1st July 1929, all country carts from the payment of tolls at the newly established toll-gates excepting those located at bridges and the frontier. Timber carts will however be subject to the levy of tolls as heretofore."

In these two statements, the Government had definitely decided the issue, but subsequently, after the Regulation came into force, toll was again levied on all sorts of carts. Representations were made to the Government from all parts of the State, and Government, convinced of the difficulties of the raiyats, passed certain orders. The Government were perhaps under the impression that those orders had given some relief to the raiyats, but it was certainly not the case. As an instance in point, he said that in the notifications issued by the Deputy Commissioners of Districts, they had reserved the right to auction the toll-gates. If at all, only a few well-informed raiyats were getting the benefit of the order and not all the poor illiterate raiyats. In spite of the two unequivocal statements of Government, toll continued to be levied on all bullock carts. It might be said that the raiyats should represent their grievances to the local authorities. In the first place, it was difficult for them to do so and in the second place, they were not sure of getting any redress at all. Thus, while the situation was bad enough, it was rendered worse by the order issued by the Government in May last to the effect that from 1st July 1936, all carts loaded with timber, stones, ores, fuel, etc., would be taxed. The order of 1929 exempted fuel carts from being taxed, but that concession had been taken away by the new order. It was needless for the speaker to dilate upon the condition of the raiyat at the present day. The prices of food grains had gone down considerably with the result that even if the raiyat sold all the crop he raised, he could hardly manage to pay the assessment. His indebtedness was almost beyond redemption. He had no other subsidiary occupations to engage and remunerate him during the off-season. The only way open to him was to collect and sell fuel and earn a few rupees once in a way. For him to bring one cartload of firewood to Bangalore, for instance, would cost about Rs. 2-12-0 by way of licence fees for cutting the wood from the jungles, tolls for outward and return journeys, felling charges, etc., and in addition he would have to pay cart hire, municipal tolls, shandy gate toll, etc. In some cases, he had to pay tolls in two places. After paying all these things, the poor raiyat would find very little left for himself. But that little would loom large in the eyes of the starving raiyat. If even this source of income was removed, the raiyat would have practically to starve. On the other hand, he would have something to fall back upon if the toll was removed.

The raiyat was undergoing another difficulty also on account of the levy of toll. Under the rules in force, he had to pay toll again at the second gate of a particular town, unless the period for covering the distance was less than half an hour. That was often difficult in the case of bullock carts. Secondly, even if he covered the distance within 30 minutes, the man in charge of the second gate would generally find it convenient to allege that the cartman had taken more than 30 minutes and therefore should pay the toll again. It was not possible for the cartman to prove his own case or to convince the gate-keeper that his time was not correct. Oftentimes, disputes would arise on this point and the cartman could not look up to any persons to arbitrate as between him and the gate-keeper, however just his case. In such cases, the cartman would rather pay, though needlessly, in order to be rid

of the gate-keeper's bother. That was another reason why tolls should be abolished. Unless this was done, there was no way of helping the poor raiyats. After all, by keeping on the tolls, the Government were not making any large income. All the same, the hardships to the raiyats were very considerable indeed.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG seconded the resolution.

Mr. ABDUL KHALEEL SAHIB instanced cases wherein, within a distance of 4 or 5 miles, toll had to be paid twice or even thrice, and observed that in such cases there was no justice in levying tolls, if at all, more than once. In the case of poor Adikarnatakas, he emphasized that toll should not be collected even once. As regards fuel carts generally, he said that the raiyats would never have much room for complaint if they could secure licences from competent authorities early, but that was not to be. Each raiyat had to go all the way to the taluk headquarter and waste at least one or two days before getting a licence. Instead of that, if the village panchayets themselves were authorised to issue licences, much of the difficulty would disappear. And in all cases, he wanted that no tax be collected—either licence fee or toll—if only one cartload of fuel, though meant for sale, was involved.

Mr. V. V. IYER supported the resolution and said that in the malnad particularly the toll was an unmeaning levy specially because the fuel itself could be removed from the forests under free licences. In the case of stone and timber carts also, he urged for exemption in view of the promise made by Government in the past. That promise at present was being observed more in the breach than in the observance. He brought to notice in this connection that Government had stated that exemptions from toll would be granted in all cases where special permits issued by the chairmen of village panchayets were produced. But the toll-gate-keepers were always saying that such permits were unauthorised and the raiyats were therefore being compelled to pay the toll. Though they could hardly afford to pay, the raiyats would rather pay than go to the Amildar in appeal in the vain hope of getting relief. The only way to obviate all these difficulties, he said, was to exempt all agricultural carts from tolls, whatever their contents.

Messrs. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA, M. S. SIDDALINGA SETTY and others observed that there was no difference of opinion amongst the members so far as this resolution went. There was therefore no need for the members to discuss the resolution because they were more anxious to hear the reply of Government.

Speaking for Government, **the REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman)** stated that it had come to his notice that payment of toll was insisted upon only in cases where doubt was felt as to whether the cart in question was an agriculturist's cart at all. But there was no doubt that this meant hardship in a large number of cases. So Government had issued orders recently specifying the carts on which alone toll should be levied. Thus, in future the hardship complained of would not be experienced by agriculturists. According to these orders, it was proposed to levy toll only in the case of carts carrying timber, fuel, stone, ores, and bamboos.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA, interrupting, asked whether by stones were meant only stone slabs meant for sale or size stones meant for ordinary domestic purposes.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN replied that tolls should be paid on all kinds of stones. The idea of Government, he said, was to levy toll on all carts conveying things other than agricultural.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA asked whether the new rule referred to was meant to be applied to all taluks.

Mr. ANANTARAMAN replied in the affirmative.

Mr. C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY pleaded for exemption in the case of fuel carts only.

Mr. V. VENKATAPPA represented that agriculturists were not selling fuel as a commercial proposition and that

they were doing so solely with a view to eke out their livelihood. As such, the levy of toll would be unjustified. Secondly, fuel carts were exempt from tolls in the past and therefore the levy of tolls was unwarranted.

Mr. ANANTARAMAN replied that he was aware of a large number of men who had taken to fuel selling as a business particularly in the Mysore and Bangalore Districts.

Mr. PRESIDENT however stated that the question of exempting fuel carts would be looked into again.

In view of this reply, the mover withdrew the resolution by leave of the House.

DEWAN'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

MEMBERS OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY,

We have come to the end of what has been a long, and, speaking from the point of view of Government, a profitable session. We have found time, not only for a full discussion of the budget, but also for an examination of the general principles of six Bills, some of them of considerable importance. Two of these have evoked a certain amount of criticism, namely, the Bill further to amend the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation and the Debt Conciliation Bill. In the case of the first, I have already explained that the objection taken appears to be based on a misconception. The sole object of the Bill is to prevent vexatious applications being filed at a late stage of a suit. While the new measure will defeat the tactics of dishonest litigants, it will in no way prejudice the *bona fide* debtor.

The criticism in the matter of the Debt Conciliation Bill was aimed rather at the Government's own loan policy than at the principles of the Bill, which were generally approved. In this case I think there was some disposition to overlook facts and figures which I thought were generally known. The Government in their money lending transactions to agriculturists have made themselves liable for a sum of no less than Rs. 25 lakhs and while the rates of interest are very low, they are by no means certain of securing recovery in all cases. The sum of Rs. 25 lakhs is made up of Rs. 14 lakhs for takavi and agricultural loans, one lakh for sericulture and fruit culture, three lakhs lent through co-operative societies, four lakhs guaranteed to the land mortgage bank and three lakhs just sanctioned for coffee planters.

To turn now to the budget, I am charged, as on previous occasions, with over-estimating the revenue and at the same time with providing inadequate funds for items of progress that are urgently required.

As regards the first point, every Finance Minister presenting a budget is placed on the horns of a dilemma. If he takes an optimistic view of the revenues, he is charged with over-estimating in order to enable him to spend what he has not got and to conceal what is really a deficit. If he takes a pessimistic view of the revenues, he is charged with cowardice and hoarding and with depriving the people of remissions of taxation which are their due. I am at present on trial on the first charge, but having regard to the latest figures of revenue receipts, I am fully anticipating that when the matter next comes under discussion I shall be put on trial on the latter. I can only say that the Finance Department have made their estimates on the best advice available to them at the time and that I shall defend either charge with equanimity.

As regards the criticism that Government are starving rural reconstruction, I can only assure you that Government are doing their best in this matter. The respects in which more money has been asked for under this head are (1) education, (2) irrigation, (3) drinking water wells, and (4) village improvements and rural reconstruction generally.

In the case of education, a demand has been made for an additional half a lakh and my answer is that an additional half a lakh has been provided. It has been suggested that the grant of Rs. 15,000 provided for expansion of primary education is only a repetition

of last year's grant of that amount, but a careful scrutiny will show that it is in addition to it. Over and above that we are involved in an expenditure of Rs. 5,800 on taking over primary schools hitherto conducted by the Methodist Mission, and in other charges which bring up the aggregate additional provision for primary education to Rs. 40,000. And the addition of the chronic deficit of the Malnad Local Education authorities will make up the remainder of the half a lakh. In the case of middle schools, I am glad to say that we have been able to sanction the starting of five more, three of them Kannada, one Urdu and the fifth for girls, which I am sure you will all agree is a very substantial advance.

In the case of irrigation, if I were charged with spending too much and not with spending too little, I should find it harder to defend myself. In the British Provinces I believe there is still a rule which prohibits a project being taken up unless it offers a return of six per cent. That is a rule that we have discarded here. We look for our returns in the greater productiveness of the soil and the greater prosperity of the people. We have actually spent 91½ lakhs on tanks and irrigation in the last 12 years, 13½ lakhs of this being spent on restoration of minor tanks and nearly 12 lakhs on repairs to irrigation works. In addition to this we have lent over Rs. 7½ lakhs to the raiyats to help them in finding their share of the cost.

As regards drinking water and rural reconstruction generally, we have considered very carefully the representations that have been made for increased grants and, at the risk of being accused of spending money that we have not got, have decided to give another Rs. 75,000 in response to the representations of members. Of this Rs. 25,000 will be for drinking water wells and Rs. 50,000 for rural reconstruction as a whole.

I should like, in passing, to clear up two small account questions that have been raised. It is claimed that the interest on the sinking fund is not revenue and on the other hand that there ought to be expenditure in the shape of interest on panchayet accounts. My reply to the first of these claims is that, so long as the sinking funds suffice to pay the amount due on loans at the due dates, it is not a matter of primary importance whether the money is contributed through interest or otherwise. As regards the second, the Government in its transactions with the panchayets does not act as a banker and if it did, would, under current conditions, be able to give only a very low rate of interest. On the whole it seems to us much better and more likely to result in an equitable distribution if the assistance is given to the panchayets in the shape of direct grants.

Before closing, I should like to refer briefly to the very interesting and animated discussion we have had to-day on the Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Regulations and Rules relating to the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council.

Let me assure you at once that Government will give the most careful consideration to the several suggestions and representations you have made in this connection. Government are aware that this Assembly occupies a special position in our constitution. It is in the words of His Highness the Maharaja, "essentially a body for consultation and reference as well as representation, directly voicing the needs of the people." In passing orders on the recommendations of the Committee, Government will take care to preserve its essential character, and to make it a more and more useful and effective limb of the administration.

I trust that you will accept this assurance as coming from one who is a sincere well-wisher of this House.

To conclude, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me say how grateful I am that the last budget which I am presenting to this Assembly, as now composed, is a surplus budget, and that we have been able, out of the surplus, to accede to the requests of the Assembly to the extent of an additional grant of Rs. 75,000 for rural reconstruction. We have passed, since the first time we examined the budget together, through an economic

and political storm of great magnitude. Even to-day there are heavy clouds on the horizon, but I personally feel that the sun is beginning to shine through them, and I hope that when we meet to discuss another budget,—perhaps under a somewhat modified constitution, perhaps with some new members replacing some of those who are present here to-day,—we shall meet with the predictions of prosperity fulfilled and be able to embark on a new era of peace and progress.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY expressed the thanks of the House to the President and the Vice-Presidents for the patient hearing extended by them to the members throughout the Session and for the sympathetic replies made by them to the various requests and suggestions preferred by the members. He also requested that the sentiments of loyalty of the members to the person and throne of His Highness the Maharaja be kindly submitted to His Highness the Maharaja.

With three Cheers to His Highness the Maharaja proposed by Khan Bahadur Mahomed Abbas Khan, the Assembly adjourned at 5-45 p.m. sine die.

BANGALORE,
Dated 13th July 1936.

C. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR,
Secretary,
Mysore Representative Assembly.